

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant respectfully acknowledges receipt of the Office Action mailed September 9, 2005. Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for conducting the telephone conference on November 9, 2005, regarding the discrepancy with dependent claim 16. The Examiner confirmed there was an error on page 3 of the Office Action, and that claim 16 should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP Patent No. 11-285,132. Applicant requests the Examiner acknowledge this error in the subsequent papers.

In the Office Action, the Examiner: (1) rejected claims 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2; (2) rejected claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *JP '132* (JP Patent No. 11-285,132); and (3) indicated claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this Amendment, Applicant amends the specification and claims 13, 14 and 16, cancels claim 15, and adds new claims 17 and 18. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 13, 14, and 16-18 will remain pending. Of these claims, claims 13 and 18 are independent. Claims 1-12 were previously withdrawn in a "Response to Restriction Requirement" filed March 4, 2005.

The originally-filed specification, claims, abstract, and drawings fully support the amendments to the specification and claims 13, 14 and 16 and the addition of new claims 17 and 18. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claim 16. However, Applicant has not rewritten claim 16 to include all of the

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims because at least independent claim 13, without any substantive amendment, is patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art.

Applicant traverses each of the above rejections and respectfully requests reconsideration for at least the reasons that follow.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2 REJECTION

Claims 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner asserts “[r]egarding claim 14, line 2, ‘within a range’ is unclear...[r]egarding claim 16, the control terminals and the output terminals being ‘put together’ in the folded part and ‘put together and arranged’ in the connector cavity are unclear...” (*Office Action*, p. 2, ll. 6-12).

Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 14 to recite, *inter alia*, “the folded part is set between the relay fixing part and each of the control terminals and output terminals, providing a connection range wherein the control terminals and the output terminals can be arranged in the connector cavity.” In addition, Applicant has amended claim 16 to recite, *inter alia*, “the control terminals and the output terminals extend from the periphery of the relay fixing part and the folded part, and are arranged in the connector cavity.”

Consequently, the rejections of claims 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2 are now moot, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) REJECTION

Applicant submits that independent claim 13 is patentably distinguishable under 35 U.S.C. §102 over the cited references, including *JP '132*, and the other art of record. The cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest each element of the invention recited in independent claim 13. In particular, the applied reference, taken alone or in combination, at least fails to teach or suggest an electrical junction box comprising: a first bus bar which has a power terminal formed therein and distributes and supplies power derived from the power terminal; a second bus bar in which a plurality of relay parts, to which power is supplied from the first bus bar, are fixed to each relay fixing part and control terminals and output terminals of the relay parts are formed; and a case which houses the first and second bus bars therein and has a connector cavity part in which the power terminal, the control terminals and the output terminals are arranged, wherein, in the second bus bar, a folded part which is folded in a plane direction of the bus bar is formed, and the folded part is folded substantially at a right angle to a direction in which the relay parts are fixed to the relay fixing part and is folded substantially at a right angle to the control terminals and the output terminals.

Applicant notes that in order to properly anticipate Applicant's claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. §102, each and every element of the claim in issue must be found, "either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.

Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989)." See M.P.E.P. § 2131, 8th ed., 2001.

JP '132 discloses an upper wiring board 31, composed of an insulating board 40 with bus-bars 41 and 42, and a standing wiring board 26, composed of an insulating board 47 with bus-bars 48, which is placed in a state of crossing with respect to the upper wiring board 31. (*JP '132*, Abstract). *JP '132*, however, is silent as to having a folded part, folded in a plane direction, formed in the bus-bars 41 and 42 of upper wiring board 31 or in the bus-bars 48 of standing wiring board 26. As illustrated in Figures 10 and 11 of the present invention, "folded part 34 is folded nearly right-angled to a direction in which coils 6a and switches (not shown) are fixed, and, at the same time is folded nearly right-angled to the control terminals 16 and the output terminals 17." (*Specification*, p. 17, line 28 -- p. 18, line 3). Accordingly, *JP '132* necessarily fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination including *inter alia*: "wherein, in the second bus bar, a folded part which is folded in a plane direction of the bus bar is formed," as recited in amended claim 13 (emphasis added). For at least these reasons, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn and claim 13 be allowed.

Moreover, claims 14 and 16 are allowable at least due to their dependence from independent claim 13. In addition, at least some of the dependent claims recite unique combinations that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, and therefore some also are separately patentable.

Applicant further submits that new independent claim 18 is patentably distinguishable under 35 U.S.C. §102 over the cited references, including *JP '132*, and the other art of record, at least for reasons similar to those discussed with regard to independent claim 13. In particular, the cited prior art at least fails to disclose or

suggest *inter alia*: "wherein, in the second bus bar, a folded part which is folded in a plane direction of the bus bar is formed." Moreover, new claim 17 is allowable at least due to its dependence from independent claim 13.

III. CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 13 and 18 are in condition for allowance. In addition, claims 14, 16, and 17 are in condition for allowance at least due to their dependence from independent claim 13.

The Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and the related art with which Applicant does not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicant declines to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER,
L.L.P.

Dated: December 7, 2005

By: 
David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220